

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-96 are pending, with claims 1, 15, 21 and 27-32 being independent. Claims 27-96 were previously withdrawn from consideration. Claim 3 has been canceled and claims 1, 15 and 21 have been amended to include the subject matter of claim 3. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 12-26 have been rejected as being anticipated by Edwards (U.S. 2002/0077160). Claims 1, 15 and 21 have been amended to recite that "one of the first and second housings includes a transmitting unit while the other of the first and second housings includes a receiving unit," as was previously recited in claim 3 (which was not rejected in view of Edwards). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Edwards does not describe or suggest such an arrangement of transmitting and receiving units.

Claims 3, 4 and 6-11 were rejected as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Yoon. The rejection asserts that Yoon would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Edwards to have one of the first housing and the second housing include a transmitting unit while the other includes a receiving unit. In particular, the rejection asserts that this motivation would have been "to specifically point out the arrangement of typical device components, such as the transmitting unit, the receiving unit, and the display." Applicants disagree.

Edwards states, in paragraph [0020] that "the antenna of certain handheld devices, such as satellite phones, must extend above the user's head" and that the "cover 24 operates as an extender for antenna 21" and "extends beyond the user's ear so that it provides the highest possible antenna base without requiring an antenna extension of the like." Thus, Edwards indicates that it is important to maximize the distance that the antenna extends from the components with which it operates, which would weigh against moving components to Edwards' cover. (Moreover, in order to maintain a consistent distance between the microphone and the speaker, the size of Edwards device would need to be reduced if the microphone or speaker were moved to the cover, and this, in turn, would lower the antenna base, which is contrary to the teaching of Edwards.)

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/072,496  
Filed : February 5, 2002  
Page : 17 of 17

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-301001 / US5497

In addition, the figures of Edwards (particularly Fig. 4) show where components of the phone, including the microphone and the receiver, are located, and clearly indicate that the cover does not include any functional components other than the antenna. As such, since Edwards already shows where components of the phone, including the microphone and the speaker, are located, Yoon's mere illustration of placing them elsewhere would not have provided any motivation for moving them.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$120 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/12/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331